arXiv:1612.04208v3 [cs.DS] 1 Mar 2017

An $\tilde{O}(n^2)$ Time Matrix Multiplication Algorithm

Submitted to JACM

Yijie Han

School of Computing and Engineering
University of Missouri at Kansas City
Kansas City, MO 64110, USA

Abstract

We show that with $n \log^c n$ time preprocessing independently for vectors $(a_0, a_1, ..., a_{n-1})$ and $(b_0, b_1, ..., b_{n-1})$, where c is a constant, the vector multiplication $(a_0, a_1, ..., a_{n-1})(b_0, b_1, ..., b_{n-1})^T$ can be computed in $\log^c n$ time. This gives a matrix multiplication algorithm with time complexity $\tilde{O}(n^2)$.
Keywords: Algorithms, matrix multiplication, efficient algorithms.

1 Introduction

Let n^ω be the time for matrix multiplication. It is trivial that $\omega \leq 3$. Strassen first showed that $\omega < 2.81$ [15]. After Strassen's result there is a series of work improving the time bound. Pan [11] showed $\omega < 2.796$. Bini et al. [3] obtained $\omega < 2.78$. Schönhage [13] showed that $\omega < 2.522$. Romani [12] got $\omega < 2.517$. Coppersmith and Winograd [5] obtained $\omega < 2.496$. In 1986, Strassen then obtained that $\omega < 2.479$. In 1990 Coppersmith and Winograd [6] obtained the $\omega < 2.376$ bound that lasted more than twenty years. Only until 2012 Williams [16] improved the bound to $\omega < 2.3727$. A weaker improvement is also found by Stothers [14].

In addition there are works on multiplying rectangular matrices. Coppersmith showed [7, 8] that an $n \times n^{0.294}$ matrix can be multiplied with an $n^{0.294} \times n$ matrix in $n^{2+\epsilon}$ time. Huang and Pan then generalized this to any rectangular matrix multiplication [10]. Very recently Gall showed [9] that an $n \times n^{0.30298}$ matrix can be multiplied with an $n^{0.30298} \times n$ matrix in $O(n^{2+\epsilon})$ time.

The algorithms we mentioned before are for real valued matrices. For Boolean matrix multiplication and integer matrix multiplication there are no better algorithm other than those algorithms mentioned above. However, the "Four Russians" algorithm by Arlazarov, Dinic, Kronrod, and Faradzhev [1] has time $O(n^3/\log n)$ but can be improved to $O(n^3/\log^2 n)$ for Boolean matrix multiplication, Bansal and Williams [2] obtained an $O(n^3(\log\log n)^2/\log^{9/4} n)$ time algorithm for Boolean matrix multiplication, Chan [4] obtained an $O(n^3(\log\log n)^3/\log^3 n)$ time algorithm for Boolean matrix multiplication and Yu [17] obtained an $O(n^3(\log\log n)^c/\log^4 n)$ time algorithm for Boolean matrix multiplication.

In this paper we present an $\tilde{O}(n^2)$ time algorithm for matrix multiplication, where $\tilde{O}(f(n)) = O(f(n)\log^c n)$ for a constant c. In our case $c < 3$. We use a completely different approach to the problem and the design of our algorithm is via a new path of thought. We have been working on achieving fast matrix multiplication algorithms for more than ten years and fortunately we have reached our goal.

2 The Design

Let $i\#k$ be the k-th bit of i with the least significant bit as the 0-th bit. Our approach for computing $(a_0, a_1, ..., a_{n-1})(b_0, b_1, ..., b_{n-1})^T$ is to compute

$$(a_0, a_1, ..., a_{n-1})(b_0, b_1, ..., b_{n-1})^T = \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} (a_i b_j (\prod_{k=0}^{\log n-1} ((1-(i\#k))(1-j\#k)+(i\#k)(j\#k)))) \quad (1)$$

In order to compute (1) we first study the problem of extracting the result of $\prod_{i=0}^{\log n-1} c_i$ from

$$(\sum_{i=0}^{\log n-1} c_i)^{\log n} \quad (2)$$

We use an indeterminate x and 2 primes p and q and code (2) as

$$(\sum_{i=0}^{\log n-1} c_i x^{\prod_{m=0}^{\log\log n-1} (p^{1-(i\#m)} q^{i\#m})})^{\log n} \quad (3)$$

There are $(\log n)^{\log n}$ uncombined terms in (3). The term in (3) for $\prod_{i=0}^{\log n-1} c_i$ is

$$(\prod_{i=0}^{\log n-1} c_i) x^{\sum_{i=0}^{\log n-1} (\prod_{m=0}^{\log\log n-1} (p^{1-(i\#m)} q^{i\#m}))} = (\prod_{i=0}^{\log n-1} c_i) x^{(p+q)^{\log\log n}} \quad (4)$$

Lemma 1: If we have computed (3) then the coefficient of $x^{(p+q)^{\log\log n}}$ is $\prod_{i=0}^{\log n-1} c_i$.
Proof: Let $D = dx^{(p+q)^{\log\log n}}$ be an uncombined term in (3). Let the $d_0 x^{pa}$ be the part (factor) of D that contain c_i's with $(i\#(\log\log n - 1)) = 0$ and $d_1 x^{qb}$ be the part (factor) of D that contain c_i's with $(i\#(\log\log n - 1)) = 1$. Then

$$pa + qb = (p+q)^{\log\log n} = (p+q)(p+q)^{\log\log n-1} \quad (5)$$

If $a = b$ then $a = b = (p+q)^{\log\log n-1}$. Else we have that

$$q(b-a) = (p+q)((p+q)^{\log\log n-1} - a) \quad (6)$$

Thus if $(p+q)^{\log\log n-1} - a = 0$ then we have that $a = b = (p+q)^{\log\log n-1}$ and else $((p+q)^{\log\log n-1} - a)$ divides $(b-a)$ and we have q divides $p+q$ which is impossible or contradiction. Thus the conclusion is that $a = b = (p+q)^{\log\log n-1}$.

Repeatedly (or recursively) applying this argument will confirm that $d = \prod_{i=0}^{\log n-1} c_i$. Since there is only one uncombined term with coefficient $\prod_{i=0}^{\log n-1} c_i$, we can extract $\prod_{i=0}^{\log n-1} c_i$ out of (3) by taking the coefficient of $x^{(p+q)^{\log\log n}}$. □

We call Lemma 1 as using $(p+q)^{\log\log n}$ to positioning c_i's, $i = 0, 1, ..., \log n - 1$.

(3) can be used for the purpose of (1) except c_k should be replaced with $(1-(i\#k))(1-(j\#k))+(i\#k)(j\#k)$. Note that at most one of $(1-(i\#k))(1-(j\#k))$ and $(i\#k)(j\#k)$ will not be equal to 0. We will use four additional primes p_0, q_0, p_1, q_1 such that $p_0 + q_0 = p_1 + q_1$. For example we can let $p_0 = 3$, $q_0 = 17$, $p_1 = 7$, $q_1 = 13$. And we use $c_e, e = 0, 1, ..., 4\log n - 1$, with $c_{4k} = 1-(i\#k)$, $c_{4k+1} = 1-(j\#k)$, $c_{4k+2} = i\#k$, and $c_{4k+3} = j\#k$, $k = 0, 1, ..., \log n - 1$. We then modify (3) to be

$$(\sum_{i=0}^{\log n-1}(c_{4i}x^{p_0}\prod_{m=0}^{\log\log n-1}(p^{1-(i\#m)}q^{i\#m})+c_{4i+1}x^{q_0}\prod_{m=0}^{\log\log n-1}(p^{1-(i\#m)}q^{i\#m})+c_{4i+2}x^{p_1}\prod_{m=0}^{\log\log n-1}(p^{1-(i\#m)}q^{i\#m})+$$
$$c_{4i+3}x^{q_1}\prod_{m=0}^{\log\log n-1}(p^{1-(i\#m)}q^{i\#m}))^{2\log n} \quad (7)$$

The power becomes $2\log n$ because $(1-(i\#k))$ and $(1-(j\#k))$ that must be picked up from different positions are multiplied together. The same holds for $(i\#k)$ and $(j\#k)$. The almost same arguments used in Lemma 1 can be used to prove that the coefficient of $x^{(p_0+q_0)(p+q)^{\log\log n}}$ (note here that $p_0+q_0=p_1+q_1$) is $\prod_{k=0}^{\log n-1}((1-(i\#k))(1-j\#k)+(i\#k)(j\#k))$. Here $(p+q)^{\log\log n}$ will positioning that there are $(p_0+q_0)\prod_{m=0}^{\log\log n-1}(p^{1-(i\#m)}q^{i\#m})$ in the power coming from positions $4i,4i+1,4i+2,4i+3$. Besides, there are a total of $2\log n$ multiplicands. The possibilities are with the coefficient of c_ic_{i+1}, or $c_{i+2}c_{i+3}$ from positions $4i,4i+1,4i+2,4i+3$. Although $c_i^2c_{i+2}^2$ will provide $2\cdot 3+2\cdot 7=20=3+17$, such choice cannot be taken because it involves 4 multiplicands. For if it is taken, then because one multiplicand in any $4i,4i+1,4i+2,4i+3$ positions cannot produce the power of $p_0+q_0=20$, thus because there are only $2\log n$ multiplicands some of of the positions $4i,4i+1,4i+2,4i+3$ will have less than 2 multiplicands and cannot form $(p_0+q_0)\prod_{m=0}^{\log\log n-1}(p^{1-(i\#m)}q^{i\#m})$ and therefore violate the positioning stipulation. Thus the only possibility for satisfying the positioning requirement is that every $4i,4i+1.4i+2.4i+3$ positions will have $c_{4i}c_{4i+1}$ or $c_{4i+2}c_{4i+3}$. Now only the choice of either $c_{4i}c_{4i+1}$ or $c_{4i+2}c_{4i+3}$ will give the factor of p_0+q_0. Note that at least one of the choices is 0. Thus the coefficient of $x^{(p_0+q_0)(p+q)^{\log\log n}}$ is $\prod_{k=0}^{\log n-1}((1-(i\#k))(1-j\#k)+(i\#k)(j\#k))$. Thus for the multiplication of a_ib_j we write as

$$\sum_{l=0}^{2\log n}\binom{2\log n}{l}(a_i(\sum_{k=0}^{\log n-1}((1-(i\#k))x^{p_0}\prod_{m=0}^{\log\log n-1}(p^{1-(k\#m)}q^{k\#m})$$
$$+(i\#k)x^{p_1}\prod_{m=0}^{\log\log n-1}(p^{1-(k\#m)}q^{k\#m}))^{2\log\log n-l})$$
$$\cdot(b_j(\sum_{k=0}^{\log n-1}((1-(j\#k))x^{q_0}\prod_{m=0}^{\log\log n-1}(p^{1-(k\#m)}q^{k\#m})$$
$$+(j\#k)x^{q_1}\prod_{m=0}^{\log\log n-1}(p^{1-(k\#m)}q^{k\#m}))^l) \quad (8)$$

The coefficient of $x^{(p_0+q_0)(p+q)^{\log\log n}}$ in (8) is 0 if $i\neq j$ and is a_ib_j if $i=j$.

Thus the vector multiplication $(a_0,a_1,...,a_{n-1})(b_0,b_1,...,b_{n-1})^T$ can be written as

$$\sum_{l=0}^{2\log n}\binom{2\log n}{l}(\sum_{i=0}^{n-1}(a_i(\sum_{k=0}^{\log n-1}((1-(i\#k))x^{p_0}\prod_{m=0}^{\log\log n-1}(p^{1-(k\#m)}q^{k\#m})$$
$$+(i\#k)x^{p_1}\prod_{m=0}^{\log\log n-1}(p^{1-(k\#m)}q^{k\#m}))^{2\log\log n-l}))$$
$$\cdot(\sum_{j=0}^{n-1}(b_j(\sum_{k=0}^{\log n-1}((1-(j\#k))x^{q_0}\prod_{m=0}^{\log\log n-1}(p^{1-(k\#m)}q^{k\#m})$$
$$+(j\#k)x^{q_1}\prod_{m=0}^{\log\log n-1}(p^{1-(k\#m)}q^{k\#m}))^l)) \quad (9)$$

The coefficient of $x^{(p_0+q_0)(p+q)^{\log\log n}}$ in (9) is $\sum_{i=0}^{n-1}\sum_{j=0}^{n-1}(a_ib_j(\prod_{k=0}^{\log n-1}((1-(i\#k))(1-(j\#k))+(i\#k)(j\#k))))=(a_0,a_1,...,a_{n-1})(b_0,b_1,...,b_{n-1})^T$

Here we raised the power of x to $\log^c n$ for a constant c. If we pick $p=2$ and $q=3$ then the power of x is $(3^{\log\log n}+17)\cdot(2\log n)<\log^3 n$. Thus the vector preprocessing time is $n\log^c n$ for size n vector and the multiplication of two size n vectors is $\log^c n$ time for a constant c.

Thus matrix multiplication can be done with $n^2\log^c n$ preprocessing , where $c<4$ because we raise the power of x to $O(3^{\log\log n}\log n)$ and there are $2\log n$ additions in (8) and (9).

Main Theorem: Two $n \times n$ matrices can be multiplied in $\tilde{O}(n^2)$ time. □

References

[1] 1. V. Z. Arlazarov, E. A. Dinic, M. A. Kronrod, I. A. Faradzhev. On economical construction of the transitive closure of a directed graph. *Soviet Mathematics Doklady*, 11(5), 1209-1210(1970).

[2] 2. N. Bansal, R. Williams. Regularity lemmas and combinatorial algorithms. *Proc. 50th Annual IEEE Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science FOCS'2009*, 745-754(2009).

[3] 3. D. Bini, M. Capovani, F. Romani, and G. Lotti. $O(n^{2.7799})$ complexity for $n \times n$ approximate matrix multiplication. *Information Processing Letter*, 8(5):234-235(1979).

[4] 4. T. M. Chan. Speeding up the Four Russian's algorithm by about one more logarithmic factor. *Proc. 2015 ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms SODA'2015*, 212-217(2015).

[5] 5. D. Coppersmith and S. Winograd. On the asymptotic complexity of matrix multiplication. *Proc. SFCS*, 82-90(1981).

[6] 6. D. Coppersmith, S. Winograd. Matrix multiplication via arithmetic progressions. *Journal of Symb. Comput.* 9, 251-280(1990).

[7] 7. D. Coppersmith. Rapid multiplication of rectangular matrices. *SIAM J. Computing*, vol. 11, no. 3, 467-471(1982).

[8] 8. D. Coppersmith. Rectangular matrix multiplication revisited. *J. of Complexity*, vol. 13, no. 1, 42-49(1997).

[9] 9. F. Le Gall. Faster algorithms for rectangular matrix multiplication. *Proc. 2012 IEEE Foundations of Computer Science (FOCS'2012)*,514-523(2012).

[10] 10. X. Huang, V. Y. Pan. Fast rectangular matrix multiplications and applications. *J. Complex.* 14, 257-99(1998).

[11] 11. V. Y. Pan. Strassen's algorithm is not optimal. *Proc.1978 IEEE Foundations of Computer Science FOCS'78*, 166-176(1978).

[12] 12. F. Romani. Some properties of disjoint sums of tensors related to matrix multiplication. *SIAM J. Comput.*, 263?267(1982).

[13] 13. A. Schönhage. Partial and total matrix multiplication. *SIAM J. Comput.*, 10(3):434-455(1981).

[14] 14. A. Stothers, On the complexity of matrix multiplication, Ph.D. dissertation, University of Edinburgh, 2010.

[15] 15. V. Strassen. Gaussian elimination is not optimal. *Numer. Math.*, 13:354-356(1969).

[16] 16. V. V. Williams, Multiplying matrices faster than Coppersmith-Winograd. *Proceedings of the 44th ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing*, 2012, pp. 887-898.

[17] 17. H. Yu. An improved combinatorial algorithm for Boolean matrix multiplication. *Proc. of Int. Conf. on Automata, Language, and Programming ICALP'2015*, 1094-1105(2015).